

A Sim2Real Approach for Identifying Task-Relevant Properties in Interpretable Machine Learning

Eura Nofshin*, Esther Brown*, Brian Lim, Weiwei Pan, Finale Doshi-Velez

June 4, 2024

1 Introduction

In the context of human+AI interaction, explanations of the underlying function can provide additional information to assist the human in performing their task. Recent literature suggests that explanations with different properties are useful for different tasks [Liao et al., 2022, Lai et al., 2023, Chen et al., 2023, Jesus et al., 2021, Wang et al., 2019, Liao et al., 2020, Lim and Dey, 2009]. For example, in an AI-auditing task, the user may need to check whether the AI inappropriately relied on a forbidden feature, such as using gender in computing a credit score [Kaur et al., 2020, Hase and Bansal, 2020a, Lakkaraju et al., 2019]. In this case, we would want explanations that are *faithful*; that is, they reliably capture the underlying behavior of the function. On the other hand, suppose our goal is to help a user quickly understand the process by which a function produces its output; we can quantify the user’s understanding by measuring the user’s ability to approximate the function’s output, given the input and an explanation [Hase and Bansal, 2020b, Chandrasekaran et al., 2018]. In this case, we may want explanations with *low complexity*, so that the user can effectively reason using the explanation in a limited amount of time.

Unfortunately, identifying which explanation properties are needed for what tasks remains an open challenge [Hase and Bansal, 2020b, Lage et al., 2019a]. Given the large space of possibly relevant properties and their potential trade-offs, naively running user-studies to discover which properties are relevant for human decision-making in which tasks is expensive and impractical. In addition, the specifics of the tasks, settings, user populations, and explanation presentation all affect the user study results, making it challenging to generalize insights across user studies. In fact, it is not uncommon to find studies with conflicting conclusions on what appears to be the same task [Jesus et al., 2021, Bansal et al., 2020].

To identify which explanations are best for what tasks, some works have compared existing explanations, such as LIME or SHAP, to human task performance [Jesus et al., 2021, Lai et al., 2023, Jeyakumar et al., 2020, Lundberg and Lee, 2017, Miró-Nicolau et al., 2023, Abdul et al., 2020]. Other works have built computational pipelines to simulate whether a certain explanation will do well on a certain task Chen et al. [2022a, 2021]. However, without knowing *which* precise aspects of explanations made them useful (or not), these results are hard to generalize. Other works have derived explanations that have certain computational properties [Zhou et al., 2021, Chen et al., 2022b], but do not test whether these computational properties actually improve human performance on tasks. Furthermore, for each intuitive explanation property, like “faithfulness”, there exists many formalizations in the literature that differ significantly in their mathematical characteristics [Chen et al., 2022c, Zhou et al., 2021]. Most works that study the impact of an explanation property on human performance do not consider the impact that their choice of formalization has on the results Miró-Nicolau et al. [2023], Chen et al. [2022b].

In this work, we use a computational pipeline to first identify what *properties* are likely to be most relevant for a particular task, and then validate those predictions with a user study. The core idea is that while evaluating human task performance is the ultimate gold standard for determining whether an explanation is useful, we can use *generalizable, cost-effective* computational frameworks for identifying the most promising

*These authors contributed equally to this work

explanations, to help target where to invest in a more expensive user study. In addition, to our knowledge, there are no works that link computational properties of explanations to human performance on tasks in a computation pipeline wherein our assumptions (about humans, functions, tasks and explanations) are exposed and can be carefully tested.

Specifically, we (1) first directly optimize explanations for a set of properties, (2) create proxies for human task performance based on explanations using computational models of human *memory* and human *learning*, and (3) then use our proxy human to hypothesize which properties are relevant for which tasks. Finally, we validate hypotheses generated from our computational pipeline through user-studies. By linking explanation properties, rather than specific explanation methods themselves, directly to human task performance we hope to discover *generalizable* knowledge of what type of explanation is suitable for assisting human decision making for which task and why. Furthermore, our experimental results show that our computational pipeline can serve as a useful precursor to real human-studies, as it narrows down the large space of possible property-task relationships to a few promising candidates.

2 Related Work

Works that Link Explanation Properties to Human Task Performance in User Studies In Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. [2021], participants in a user-study are asked to guess the predictions of a function that outputs selling prices of apartments. Participants are shown explanations with either 8 or 2 features. Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. [2021] find that explanation compactness, defined as the number of features in the explanation, corresponded to better performance on the forward prediction task. Similarly, Lage et al. [2019a] found that certain types of complexity (explanation size, cognitive chunks) affect participant’s response time and satisfaction across different tasks (forward simulation, counterfactual reasoning, verification) and settings (inspecting a food recommender, inspecting medical treatment strategies). In Nguyen [2018], participants in a user-study are asked to guess predictions of a function that classifies the sentiment of movie reviews. The authors find that explanation faithfulness correlates with higher human performance, where faithfulness is measured by the function’s sensitivity to input perturbations along dimensions identified as important by the explanation. In these studies, the property to be studied was carefully selected based on prior work or domain knowledge. In contrast, using our computational pipeline, we are able to *first* test the effect of multiple explanation properties on the performance of our human proxy. Thus, for our user-study, we are able to choose to test a small number of properties that have been shown, in-silico, to impact performance.

The two works above explicitly varied explanation properties to connect them to task performance via user studies. Liao et al. [2022] asks both crowd-workers and experts to specify which properties they prioritize for different tasks, but they do not evaluate how these properties impact task performance. Other works connect properties to task performance *retrospectively*, after testing multiple explanations methods with different properties on the same task [Lertvitt and Toni, 2019]. Example tasks include counterfactual simulation (may need faithfulness [Hase and Bansal, 2020c]), forming good mental models (may need faithfulness, low complexity [Kulesza et al., 2013]), and joint decision-making (may need robustness [Jesus et al., 2021]).¹ In contrast, our computational framework provides a low-cost way to identify key task-relevant properties as a *precursor* to the actual user study.

Works that Connect Mathematically Formalized Properties to Explanations There is a line of work that aims to provide automatic evaluations of explanation quality, e.g. [Liu et al., 2021, Bhatt et al., 2021, Nguyen and Martínez, 2020, Lukas and Garcia]. These evaluations compute how much an explanation satisfies a certain property, such as robustness. For example, Bhatt et al. [2021] propose definitions for evaluating a feature attribution method’s robustness, faithfulness, and complexity. Because the proposed property definitions are not grounded in tasks or evaluated on real human performance, there is a lack of consensus on how to formalize and apply these properties. For example, faithfulness has been formalized as

¹In each case, specific definitions of properties (e.g. faithfulness, complexity, robustness) are chosen by the authors; not all definitions are the same.

the correlation between the magnitude of feature attribution and the change in the loss when the feature is removed Nguyen and Martínez [2020] as well as the comparison between the sum of feature attributions with sum of differences in the predictor function and a baseline. Such variations in definitions appear across all major types of properties, including complexity (e.g. Bhatt et al. [2021] vs Nguyen and Martínez [2020]) and robustness (e.g. Yeh et al. [2019] vs Hsieh et al. [2020]). Chen et al. [2022c] provide an overview of the trade-offs that exist in maximizing different properties. Our work uses a Sim2Real approach to identify what computational properties, in what forms, may be most important for predicting downstream task performance.

Using Proxy Humans to Evaluate Explanations. Several works propose proxy humans to identify promising explanation methods before testing on real humans. Like us, Chen et al. [2022b] simulate user studies with proxy humans to reduce user study costs. Unlike us, their simulations do not account for properties, and as a result, they are unable to link to *why* certain explanations, such as LIME, performed better. We will later show that by having a more transparent human proxy model, we can also be explicit about how the choice of the human model affects the insights on which properties matter.

Humans proxies have appeared in many other areas of interpretable machine learning. There is a body of works that learns human proxies from human data (e.g. survey responses) and then uses these human proxies to regularize the training or selection process of supervised ML functions so that they are easier for humans to work with [Virgolin et al., 2020, Hilgard et al., 2021, Lage et al., 2018]. Unlike us, these works do not use the human proxies to evaluate explanations.

Sim2Real Frameworks That Link Proxies to Reality To our knowledge, we are the first work to use the idea of sim2real in the context of understanding how explanation properties impact human performance, and one of the first to use the idea in any context within interpretable machine learning. That said, the idea of Sim2Real: using cheap computation to jump-start performance on more expensive physical systems, has been used in other areas of machine learning. There are examples in robotics (see surveys [Höfer et al., 2021, Kadian et al., 2020]), industrial engineering (e.g. [Lin et al., 2024]), and computer vision (e.g. [Reiher et al., 2020, Gao et al., 2022]). Of course, each sim2real application requires careful design in order to align the simulated and the target real environment.

3 Background and Notation

Human+AI decision-making involves three core components, which we formalize here: the underlying ML function (f), the explanation method (E), and the human performing the downstream task (h). In this work, we focus on local decision-making tasks, meaning that the human must repeatedly make decisions concerning each input \mathbf{x} (e.g. “what will the function predict for this input”), rather than making a one-off decision concerning the global function f (e.g. “is this function one that we can deploy?”). Many real scenarios require local decision-making Kim et al. [2023], and local decision-making tasks have a simpler structure when it comes to building a high-performing sim2real pipeline. We leave the question of what properties are important for global decision-making tasks to future work.

For the context of this work, we assume that the AI assistant is a supervised **function** $\hat{y} = f(\mathbf{x})$ that accepts an input \mathbf{x} and produces a prediction \hat{y} . The **explanation method** $E(f, \mathbf{x})$ provides the human with an explanation about the function f local to the input \mathbf{x} . Given an explanation E , one can compute its associated properties, such as sparsity or faithfulness. In the following, in order to test which properties are most important for which tasks, we will be creating explanations that do well for different properties. We will use subscripts to denote explanations selected for a certain property. For example, we will refer to a faithful explanation as E_{faithful} .

In this work, we focus on explanations that are *feature attributions* – explanations that place an importance weight on every input dimension – because of their widespread use and because several properties have been proposed to describe them [Chen et al., 2022c]. The magnitude and sign of the explanation weight represent the level of influence and direction of influence that the feature has on the function’s prediction \hat{y} .

So, if the input \mathbf{x} has D dimensions, the explanation will also be a D dimensional vector of weights. That said, our computational pipeline is general enough to handle any type of explanation.

A (real or proxy) **human** h uses explanations from E , the input to the function \mathbf{x} , and potentially other features to perform their task. We refer to all the information that the human uses for decision-making as the human input $\mathbf{x}_h = [\mathbf{x}, E(f, \mathbf{x}), \dots]$. We refer to human-produced outputs for the task as $y_h = h(\mathbf{x}_h)$. While our pipeline is general enough to allow y_h to be any human-produced output, such as response time or satisfaction, we focus on outputs that can be used to measure human accuracy on the task. For example, y_h could be a binary value indicating whether or not the function used a forbidden feature, or a real value simulating the function’s prediction. Note that the human’s task y_h may not be the same as the function’s output \hat{y} . For example, the function may have been trained to predict whether someone will pay back a loan; the user may be interested in checking whether the function is not using forbidden features to make that prediction.

4 Motivating Questions

The following two motivating questions guide our work:

Motivating Question 1: Can we computationally link explanation properties to task performance? Our first goal is to link explanation properties to human performance through computational (simulated) means. Specifically, given a task, we want to identify which explanation properties are useful for performing that task; in particular, we are interested in generalizable knowledge in the form of mappings from properties to tasks. This mapping allows developers to test—given their function—whether they need explanations with certain properties (e.g. if the feature space is highly non-linear, then they may need explanations specifically optimized for robustness).

Motivating Question 2: How well does the performance of computational proxies represent human performance? Addressing Q1 will give us a set of explanation properties that, in simulation, appear to be important for performing a task. Our second goal is to validate these computational relationships with user studies. That is, if our computational proxies for humans require a certain property for a certain task, does that translate to reality?

We note that these motivating questions are broad, and we do not attempt to address them completely in the scope of one paper. Instead, in this work, we take the first steps toward answering both questions using our sim2real pipeline. Specifically, using sim2real, we provide proof-of-concept examples of tasks where one property is preferred under simulation (Q1) and this preference continues to hold on real users (Q2).

5 A Sim2Real Approach for Connecting Explanation Properties to Human Performance in User-Studies

In this section, we describe our methodology for investigating the relationship between explanation properties and human performance in AI-assisted tasks. We first we simulate user studies with a computational pipeline. This computational pipeline consists of four components: (1) a set of tasks, (2) a set of explanation properties, (3) a method for generating explanations that maximizes a given subset of properties, (4) a computational proxy for explanation-aided human task-performance that explicitly models human memory and human task learning. Figure 1 visualizes how our pipeline can be used to explore which explanation properties are useful for each task in-silico (Question 1) before testing the hypotheses in user-studies (Question 2).

Here, we describe the general mechanisms and structures of our pipeline. Figure 2 provides an overview of the pipeline and the rest of this section describes in detail how these components come together to produce a synthetic human that produces a task performance. In Section 6, we describe two concrete instantiations of this process, and, in Section 7, we validate our findings using real user-studies. However, we emphasize that each pipeline component can be instantiated in many ways, thus providing a robust way to study a diverse range of tasks, explanation properties and computational models of humans.




Figure 1: Overview of how our synthetic pipeline may be used to generate hypotheses on which explanation properties (independent variable) will perform best (dependent variable) in each setting (experiment parameters). Using the pipeline, we can isolate the settings in which we expect differences in properties to result in differences in performance. This subset of settings is then tested in a real user study.




Figure 2: An overview of the synthetic user study block in our sim2real pipeline. The human model lets us link explanation properties to downstream task performance (the red line demonstrates this link).

Pipeline Component: Tasks. Tasks, also referred to as “use-cases”, define the downstream decisions that the human needs to make, with the aid of explanations. In particular, tasks define the types of user-studies that we will use to validate our findings. The task defines (1) what information \mathbf{x}_h the human uses to make their decision and (2) the ground-truth human decision y_h^* .

Different tasks will need different inputs \mathbf{x}_h . For example, if the human’s task is to predict the function’s output for a particular input, then they need access to the input. In contrast, in a counterfactual reasoning task, the human must predict a change in the function’s output given a change in the input. In this case, the human must also be told which input dimensions are changing, and by how much. Similarly, the specific framing of the task will determine the appropriate form of the decision. For example, a counterfactual reasoning task may be framed as predicting the size of a change (a number) or the direction of a change (a sign).

Instantiation. In this paper, we consider two popular decision-making tasks from the literature: forward prediction and forbidden features. In forward prediction, the user must simulate a function’s output ($y_h^* = \hat{y}$) given the function’s input \mathbf{x} and an explanation $E(f, \mathbf{x})$. In the forbidden features task, the user must decide whether or not the function used a forbidden feature in its prediction (i.e. $y_h^* = \mathbb{I}\{f(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x} \text{ without } d)\}$, assuming d is the forbidden feature), when provided with the function’s input \mathbf{x} and explanation $E(f, \mathbf{x})$.

We chose these tasks because prior works indicate that they will likely require different properties: humans performing forward prediction have expressed a preference for *sparse* [Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al., 2021, Hase and Bansal, 2020b] and *faithful* explanations [Lertvitt and Toni, 2019], while humans performing forbidden features have expressed a preference for *faithful* explanations [Liao et al., 2022].

Pipeline Component: Computational Explanation Properties. Computational properties of explanations quantify various characteristics of the explanation. For example, faithfulness measures how well

the explanation reflects the behavior of the true function. However, while many explanation properties are intuitive to understand, each property, such as faithfulness, may have a myriad of formal definitions in the literature (see Chen et al. [2022c] for a more extensive list of properties).

Instantiation. In this paper, we focused on three properties—robustness, faithfulness, and complexity—that are most relevant for feature attribution explanations, detailed below. Since there are multiple mathematical formalizations for each property, we choose formalizations that are both commonly used in literature and can be applied to any feature-based explanation. We narrow our focus to this family of explanation methods and properties to provide an example of how to instantiate our pipeline; the pipeline itself is generalizable to different explanation types and properties.

Robustness measures the variation in a function’s explanation when small changes are made to the input. We consider a specific formalization called *local stability* [Alvarez Melis and Jaakkola, 2018], which encapsulates a number of other formalizations of robustness as specializations [Chen et al., 2022c]. Local stability evaluates the rate of change of the explanation relative to the rate of changes of the input. The original authors referred to this definition as “local” because the explanation’s rate of change is only evaluated at “local” changes (within a distance of r) to the input and that the rate of change is normalized by how much the input itself has changed.

$$\text{local-stability}(E, f, \mathbf{x}, r) = \max_{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'\|\leq r} \frac{\|E(f, \mathbf{x}) - E(f, \mathbf{x}')\|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}. \quad (1)$$

The hyperparameter r defines the “locality” of the definition; the bigger the r , the more globally unchanging the explanation must be to evaluate well.

Faithfulness evaluates how well the explanation matches the function’s true behavior. We consider a specific formalization called *Local infidelity*, which has been applied in literature to analyze a number of explanation methods [Chen et al., 2022c]. *Local infidelity* evaluates how well the explanation method E can reproduce the behavior of the function f “locally,” near an input \mathbf{x} , instead of over the entire dataset:

$$\text{local-infidelity}(E, f, \mathbf{x}, p) = \mathbf{E}_{p(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})} [L (f(\mathbf{x}), g(\mathbf{x}', E(f, \mathbf{x})))], \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{E} is the expectation, and p is a distribution over points centered on \mathbf{x} , and L is any loss function appropriate for the task.

Complexity measures the intricacy of the explanation and is a proxy for the cognitive burden on the human when engaging with the explanation. We measure the complexity of a feature attribution explanation using *sparsity*, which counts the number of non-zero features:

$$\text{sparsity}(E) = \sum_d^D \mathbb{I}(E(f, \mathbf{x})_d \neq 0) \quad (3)$$

Here, D is the number of features, $E(f, \mathbf{x}_d)$ refers to the attribution of the d -th feature, and \mathbb{I} is an indicator function.

Pipeline Component: Property Optimized Explanations. Existing methods for generating explanations (e.g. LIME) do not necessarily generate explanations with one property or another. Thus, to answer our research questions, we explicitly optimize explanations for different properties. For example, given a formalization of faithfulness, $\text{faithfulness}(E)$, as a mathematical loss function of an explanation, E , we seek to optimize faithfulness over the set of possible values for E .

In this paper, rather than solving the above optimization problem analytically or algorithmically, we instantiate our pipeline for a few underlying ML functions, and we take advantage of our knowledge of the structures of these functions to identify explanations that are optimal concerning different properties. For example, when the underlying function is linear around an input, we return, as our explanation, the ground-truth weights of the linear function. Such explanations will be optimal in terms of faithfulness (under any formalization). Similarly, for functions that are linear and only rely on a few input dimensions around an input, we return, as our explanation, the ground-truth weights of the linear function with the largest absolute

value. Such explanations will be both faithful and sparse (again, under any formalization). We leave the fully general task of optimizing explanations for arbitrary (possibly unknown) functions as future work.

Pipeline Component: Proxy Human Model. The proxy human model \tilde{h} maps from human inputs \mathbf{x}_h to human outputs y_h . The proxy model is trained on pairs of human inputs \mathbf{x}_h and ground-truth human decisions y_h^* that are determined by the task. The proxy human model requires specifying a function class for \tilde{h} . For example, we might choose a decision tree or an MLP (as in Chen et al. [2022b]) as a proxy for how a real human may make decisions. The goal of the proxy human is not to perfectly capture human decision-making, but rather, to provide a sufficient proxy for identifying promising explanations (which will be validated in user studies). In particular, we do not aim to make mechanistic claims about how humans think; in our pipeline, one can form the human proxy from any function class. Specifying the proxy human model also requires a choice of *memory model* and *task learning model*, which correspond to assumptions about how humans process information and on how they form decision-making strategies from experience.

Human memory model. The memory model makes explicit our assumptions about how humans process inputs. Computationally, we formalize this as a *preprocessing* step on the human inputs; the memory model takes in the original human input and outputs a set of modified (for example, trimmed) features. For example, we may want our human model to capture the limitations on a person’s capacity for processing large amounts of information under time pressure. To do so, our memory model, may “mask” portions of the original input \mathbf{x}_h (for example, preserving only the top features) so that only a subset of the input is used to compute the human output y_h . The memory model may also include representational transformations of the data that we believe humans might be able to perform easily.

Human task learning model. The human learning model captures how humans learn to make decisions in a given task based on past experiences of performing the same task. Computationally, we formalize human learning as the process for optimizing \tilde{h} on training data.

Instantiation of human models. We use a decision tree of up to depth two to model \tilde{h} . We choose this model class because logic-based models are generally considered interpretable to humans (and therefore thought to mimic their decision-making), so long as the complexity of the logic rules— in our case, the depth of the tree— is not too high [Lage et al., 2019a]. The human learning model decision tree is trained on 10 training points, each consisting of an input \mathbf{x}_h paired with a correct human label y_h . The small number of training points matches the scale of training data we expect to be able to show a human in a one-sitting during a user study. We choose training points that are the most informative for understanding the function’s behavior. For example, if the function is a classifier, then we choose examples that are near the function’s decision boundary. As part of our memory model, we round the human inputs \mathbf{x}_h to one significant figure, so that the average person may perform mental math on them. We emphasize that we do not claim that human learning and decision-making is exactly like training a decision tree, only that it is a potentially reasonable proxy to be validated in our user studies.

6 Simulation Experiment: Connecting explanation properties to tasks using our pipeline.

In this section, we study Question 1 from Section 4: Can we, in simulation, identify which properties are most important for which tasks? As noted in Section 6.2.1, to demonstrate and validate our pipeline, we will focus on two tasks, forward prediction and forbidden features. We expect that each task will require a different set of properties in the explanation.

Hypothesis #1: In contexts where human’s cognitive budget is low (e.g. when making decisions under time pressure), sparsity most significantly impacts human performance on forward prediction tasks. For the **forward prediction** task, the literature suggests that high faithfulness is an important explanation property [Nguyen, 2018]. However, sparsity has also been noted as important in settings where the human has a low cognitive budget, due to the complexity of the underlying function (or

potentially time pressure) [Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al., 2021]. Therefore, we expect faithfulness to be the most important explanation property in situations where the cognitive budget is not limited. When cognition is limited, and the function decisions can be reasonably represented by a sparse explanation, we expect sparsity to be the most important property.

Hypothesis #2: Faithfulness most significantly impacts human performance on forbidden feature tasks, with very few assumptions on human cognition. For the **forbidden features** task, we expect faithfulness to be the most important property under all conditions. This is because, in the forbidden features task, the human is given an explanation of feature attribution values for each input. Each value in the explanation represents a guess at the weight given by the function to the corresponding feature. In this task, the human simply checks that the explanation value corresponding to the forbidden feature is zero or non-zero, and decides whether the underlying function has used a forbidden feature. Thus, the human’s performance in this task will depend on the faithfulness of the explanations – whether or not the weights in the explanations correctly capture the function’s true dependence on the input features.

In our experiments, we treat the set of explanation properties as the independent variable, and the performance of the human model as the dependent variable. The function, the set of inputs, as well as the proxy human model (including the memory and the learning model) constitute the set of remaining pipeline parameters that must be instantiated to run the simulation. In Section 7, we will see a benefit of our Sim2Real pipeline: we find that only some instantiations of pipeline parameters will create situations where different explanation properties have different impacts on human performance. Thus, the sim2real pipeline enables us to rule out many pipeline parameters (functions, proxy humans etc) that are unlikely to lead to a significant effect in human-studies. In our human-studies, we focus only on pipeline settings where we see significant differences in proxy human performance due to variations in explanation properties.

In the rest of this section, we define how we instantiated our synthetic user study pipeline (Section 6.1 and 6.2) to test our hypotheses (Section 6.3).

6.1 Independent Experimental Variables: Explanations that Exemplify Explanation Properties

While our pipeline is general we consider local, feature-attribution explanations in the following demonstrations. As specified in Section 6.1, we consider three explanation properties: faithfulness, robustness, and complexity. We expect that explanations low in faithfulness are unhelpful in any task. For example, an explanation that assigns the same feature attribution for all inputs is robust, but if the feature attributions does not reflect the function’s decision process (i.e. the explanation is not faithful), then this explanation is not useful for any of our tasks. Thus, within each explanation type, we enforce that the explanation satisfies the property of interest while also being *as faithful as possible*. That leaves us with two types of properties as free independent variables: robustness and complexity.

In our experiments, we consider four types of explanations: faithful explanations that are neither sparse nor robust (E_{faithful}), sparse explanations that are not robust (E_{sparse}), robust explanations that are not sparse (E_{robust}), and explanations that are both sparse and robust ($E_{\text{sparse+robust}}$). Note that we use “sparse” explanations interchangeably with “non-complex” explanations; this link is specific to our working definition of complexity from Eq. 3. We ensure that explanations are comparable in terms of non-optimized properties. For example, robust and faithful explanations are not optimized for sparsity, and we therefore enforce that both have comparable levels of sparsity; robust explanations should be significantly more robust than sparse and faithful explanations.

6.2 Instantiating Remaining Pipeline Components

The remaining pipeline parameters are the underlying function, the task, and the model of the proxy human. Together, these define the experimental setting for our independent variable (properties satisfied by the

explanation) and dependent variable (performance). In our computational experiments, we test on settings represented by all combinations of functions, tasks, and human models. In our user studies (Section 7), we will only test the combinations under which explanation properties significantly impact the performance of the human model.

6.2.1 Task Definition

We consider two tasks: forward prediction and forbidden features. In the *forward prediction* task, the human uses an explanation to help predict a function’s output. The *human’s input*, $\mathbf{x}_h = [\mathbf{x}, E(f, \mathbf{x})]$, is the concatenation of the input \mathbf{x} and explanation $E(f, \mathbf{x})$. The *human’s target* is to predict the function output. The ground-truth human answers are defined as the function’s actual output $y_h^* = f(\mathbf{x})$.

In the *forbidden features* task, the human must use an explanation to determine whether the function used a forbidden feature (designated to be one of the features in \mathbf{x}) in making its local prediction. The *human’s inputs* $\mathbf{x}_h = [\mathbf{x}, E(f, \mathbf{x}), f(\mathbf{x})]$ are the input \mathbf{x} , explanation $E(f, \mathbf{x})$, and function’s prediction $f(\mathbf{x})$. The *human’s targets* are binary and represent whether the function did ($y_h = 1$) or did not ($y_h = 0$) use a forbidden feature to make the prediction. The ground-truth human answers are defined as $y_h^* = \mathbb{I}\{f(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x} \text{ without } d)\}$, assuming d is the forbidden feature.

6.2.2 Underlying machine learning functions

The relationship between explanations and their corresponding properties depends on the geometry of the function being explained. For example, if the function is a sin wave, then a faithful feature-attribution *cannot* be robust, since the explanation weights must change to accommodate the curvature of the function. By contrast, if the function is a line, then a faithful explanation *will* be robust, since the feature-attribution is the (constant) slope of the line. For our experiments, we consider two underlying machine learning functions, f_{box} and f_{piece} , which we designed to best fit the hypotheses we want to test.




Figure 3: Visualization of the two underlying machine learning functions we used in our experimental setting.

Box function f_{box} . We designed the *Box function*, f_{box} (shown in Figure 3a) to exemplify a broader range of scenarios where the decisions of a complex function can be reasonably and approximately explained by a simplified explanation. For example, the determination of creditworthiness for a personal loan depends on a large set of factors, but can often be reasonably and approximately explained in terms of just a few (credit history, loan size, savings and income).

The *Box function* is an inherently “sparse” binary classifier, meaning that this function inherently makes predictions using only a small subset of the total features. That is, we can be certain in this case that sparse explanations will provide reasonable insights on the function’s computational process. Thus, the Box Function allows us to test our hypothesis that sparsity is an important property when human cognitive budget is limited, *and the underlying function is sufficiently simple.*

The Box Function takes in three input dimensions. At any given input, this function relies on only one input feature to make a decision. Depending on the input region, the function switches between using one of two input features, \mathbf{x}_1 or \mathbf{x}_2 , to generate its output. The switch is determined by a third input feature, \mathbf{x}_3 . Formally, the *Box function* is defined as follows:

$$f_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}_2 > 0.5\}, & \mathbf{x}_3 \leq 0.25 \\ \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}_1 > 0.5\}, & 0.25 < \mathbf{x}_3 \leq 0.5 \\ \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}_2 > 0.5\}, & 0.5 < \mathbf{x}_3 \leq 0.75 \\ \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}_1 > 0.5\}, & 0.75 < \mathbf{x}_3 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(\text{condition}(x))$ is the indicator function that returns 1 if $\text{condition}(x)$ is true, 0 otherwise. In Eq. 4, the binary classification depends on either the first \mathbf{x}_1 or second \mathbf{x}_2 input feature. The third feature \mathbf{x}_3 decides which of the two is used. For example, the first condition of f_{box} 's definition says, if \mathbf{x}_3 is less than 0.25, then the classification returns 1 if \mathbf{x}_1 is greater than 0.5 and 0 otherwise.

Piecewise linear function f_{piece} . We designed f_{piece} to be a function whose dependence on the features is highly local; depending on where the input is located, different dimensions have very different effects on the output. In this paper, for simplicity, we choose to work with a piecewise linear function, but we note that other functions, such as splines, can also satisfy the ‘‘highly local’’ quality. Importantly, in our function, many weights are small but still non-zero (e.g. a weight of 0.1), which allows us to test our hypotheses that faithful explanations, which can *capture even small dependencies on the input features*, will be important for the forbidden features task. The inputs are higher-dimensional because we found that having many inputs with small effects helped demonstrate the difference between faithful explanations that included all of these (marginally important) features vs. sparse explanations that limited themselves to only the most important features.

We define a piecewise linear function with 4 pieces and 10-dimensional inputs as follows:

$$f_{\text{piece}}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}^\top W_1 > 0\}, & \mathbf{x}_1 \leq 0.25 \\ \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}^\top W_2 > 0\}, & 0.25 < \mathbf{x}_1 \leq 0.5 \\ \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}^\top W_3 > 0\}, & 0.5 < \mathbf{x}_1 \leq 0.75 \\ \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x}^\top W_4 > 0\}, & 0.75 < \mathbf{x}_1, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where W_i refers to the i -th row of the weight matrix, defined as

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -0.1 & 0.1 & -0.1 & 0.1 & -0.1 & -0.7 \\ 0 & -0.8 & -0.2 & 0.2 & 0.1 & -0.9 & -0.1 & -0.1 & 0.1 & -0.2 & 1 \\ 0 & -0.8 & -0.2 & 0 & 0.1 & -0.9 & -0.1 & -0.1 & 0.1 & -0.2 & 1 \\ 0 & -0.05 & 1 & -0.8 & -0.1 & 0.1 & 0.9 & -0.2 & 0.1 & 0.8 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

6.2.3 Computational human model

As stated in Section 5, we use a decision tree of depth two as the human *computational* model \tilde{h} .

We represent the way humans weighs the input features \mathbf{x} by the feature attributions from $E(f, \mathbf{x})$ as the inner product between the input \mathbf{x} and explanation weights $E(f, \mathbf{x})$. This inner product is provided to the computational human model as an additional input. In terms of human cognition, this product captures the fact that the magnitude of $E(f, \mathbf{x})_d$ affects the human’s level of attention on feature d , and that the sign affects whether the human thinks of the feature d as influencing the function toward a positive classification (i.e. an output of 1 for our binary classifiers f_{box} and f_{piece}).

We considered two different *memory models* for how the proxy human obtains this inner product. The first human model, $\tilde{h}_{\text{limited}}$, assumes the human has a limited cognitive budget, and as a result, they can perform a limited number of mathematical operations to produce features for their decision-making process. We modeled this effect by including the inner product with only the two largest feature attribution weights. Our second model, $\tilde{h}_{\text{unlimited}}$, includes the full inner product as a feature for the decision tree.

6.3 Results

The results in this section verify that our explanations are optimized along the expected property axis and test our hypotheses on which properties would be helpful for different tasks.

In Table 1, we provide examples of property optimized explanations on f_{box} . As expected, the robust explanations (E_{robust} and $E_{\text{sparse+robust}}$) do not change across the two different inputs, and the sparse explanations (E_{sparse} and $E_{\text{sparse+robust}}$) have more zero terms than the non-sparse explanations.

	\mathbf{x}_1	\mathbf{x}_2
Input \mathbf{x}	$\begin{pmatrix} 0.70 & 0.50 & 0.80 & 0.10 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0.50 & 0.10 & 0.40 & 1.00 \end{pmatrix}$
E_{faithful}	$\begin{pmatrix} -1.00 & -0.96 & 0.60 & 0.50 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0.00 & -1.00 & 0.60 & 0.50 \end{pmatrix}$
E_{robust}	$\begin{pmatrix} -0.85 & -0.82 & 0.12 & 0.74 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} -0.85 & -0.82 & 0.12 & 0.74 \end{pmatrix}$
E_{sparse}	$\begin{pmatrix} -4.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 2.00 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0.00 & -1.00 & 0.00 & 0.50 \end{pmatrix}$
$E_{\text{sparse+robust}}$	$\begin{pmatrix} -1.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.57 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} -1.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.57 \end{pmatrix}$

Table 1: Example of what each property optimized explanation of f_{box} looks like for two different inputs, one input per column.

In Table 2, we verify that each explanation scores best on the property for which it was optimized. For example, E_{robust} and $E_{\text{sparse+robust}}$ score best on both robustness metrics (max sensitivity and local robustness) when compared to all other explanation types. Second, explanations score similarly on properties for which they are not being optimized. For example, all of the non-sparse explanations (E_{faith} and E_{robust}) evaluate to similar levels of sparsity.

Model	Property	E_{faithful}	E_{robust}	E_{sparse}	$E_{\text{sparse+rob.}}$
f_{box}	Local Infidelity	0.01 ± 0.0	0.34 ± 0.03	0.04 ± 0.01	0.36 ± 0.03
	Sparsity	3.91 ± 0.02	4.00 ± 0.00	2.0 ± 0.0	2.0 ± 0.0
	Local Stability ($r = 0.1$)	46.34 ± 17.37	0.0 ± 0.0	59.83 ± 2.85	0.0 ± 0.0
f_{piece}	Sparsity	9.46 ± 0.03	9.0 ± 0.0	2.0 ± 0.0	2.0 ± 0.0
	Local Infidelity	0.0 ± 0.0	0.42 ± 0.03	0.45 ± 0.03	0.42 ± 0.03
	Local stability ($r = 2$)	15.18 ± 0.30	0.0 ± 0.0	13.09 ± 0.25	0.0 ± 0.0

Table 2: Optimization results. Numbers are mean property values of the explanation at each input, with 95% confidence intervals. Rows are each property optimized explanation. Lower is more optimized. Bolded numbers are outside the CI of unbolded numbers. For local stability, r refers to the radius parameter from Eq. 1. For local infidelity, p refers to the distribution centered on the input point from Eq. 2.

Some values in Table 2 are zero due to our process for optimizing the explanations. The robust explanations produce a local infidelity score of zero because, to optimize for robustness, we choose a global explanation that is as faithful as possible. Since these explanations are global, they do not change with the inputs and evaluate to zero under the definition of local stability in Eq. 1. This also means the sparsity level of each robust explanation is constant and results in zero variance. Similarly, the sparse explanations have zero variance because, to optimize for sparsity, we always pick the two largest feature attributions (the sparsity level is always two). Finally, the faithful explanations are zero because, to optimize for faithfulness, we return the ground-truth weights of the underlying function. Since these weights are the same as the function, the loss will be zero when evaluated at each point. The non-zero values (Local Infidelity is 0.01 for E_{faithful} on f_{box}) are caused by the fact that we round the optimized weights in our human model.

Tables 3 and 4 report the human model’s performance on our tasks. In these tables, we find evidence supporting our hypotheses. Specifically, in Table 3, E_{faith} is important for the forward prediction task when the human model has no constraints on the cognitive budget ($\tilde{h}_{\text{unlimited}}$). When constraints are introduced ($\tilde{h}_{\text{limited}}$), E_{sparse} remain the sole important feature for f_{box} . Note E_{sparse} is not helpful for f_{piece} because the function depends densely on all of the inputs.

		E_{faithful}	E_{robust}	E_{sparse}	$E_{\text{sparse+rob.}}$
f_{box}	$\tilde{h}_{\text{limited}}$	0.69 ± 0.06	0.67 ± 0.07	0.88 ± 0.1	0.67 ± 0.07
	$\tilde{h}_{\text{unlimited}}$	0.92 ± 0.1	0.67 ± 0.07	0.88 ± 0.1	0.67 ± 0.07
f_{piece}	$\tilde{h}_{\text{limited}}$	0.51 ± 0.04	0.54 ± 0.04	0.51 ± 0.04	0.54 ± 0.04
	$\tilde{h}_{\text{unlimited}}$	0.99 ± 0.0	0.54 ± 0.04	0.51 ± 0.04	0.54 ± 0.04

Table 3: Performance of proxy human on prediction with 95% confidence intervals. Rows are each property optimized explanation. Higher is better; performance is over 10 trials.

		E_{faithful}	E_{robust}	E_{sparse}	$E_{\text{sparse+rob.}}$
f_{box}	$\tilde{h}_{\text{limited}}$	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00
	$\tilde{h}_{\text{unlimited}}$	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00
f_{piece}	$\tilde{h}_{\text{limited}}$	0.94 ± 0.08	0.56 ± 0.07	0.53 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.07
	$\tilde{h}_{\text{unlimited}}$	0.94 ± 0.08	0.56 ± 0.07	0.53 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.07

Table 4: Performance of proxy human on forbidden features with 95% confidence intervals. Rows are each property optimized explanation. Higher is better; performance is over 10 trials.

Finally, for the forbidden features task in Table 4, E_{faith} is the most important property for explaining on f_{piece} , as expected. Performances on the forbidden features task for f_{box} are all perfect because we define the forbidden feature to be one that is always used by f_{box} (and therefore, there was only one label). This is a scenario in which the explanation did not help the human model with the task, and thus we expected no difference in performance among the explanation types; this is indeed the case. This result is an example where the sim2real pipeline informs us that that variation in explanation properties is unlikely to impact real human performance on the forbidden features task using f_{box} as the underlying function. Thus, this would not be a setting we would test in our user studies.

7 Validating Results from Pipeline with Real User Studies

In this experiment, we aim to study Question 2: Can we link the performance of computational proxies for humans to the performance of real humans? To do this, we design user studies to test whether the relationships we found in the sim2real pipeline still hold on real humans.

Adapting computational human tasks to a user-friendly story scenario. We create two toy tasks for humans to perform in user studies, one for forward prediction and one for forbidden features. These tasks are identical to those of the computational experiments in Section 6, except that we wrap the presentation of the information (such as the inputs, functions, and human outputs) within a semantically meaningful story scenario.

In our toy scenario, we use a hypothetical setting related to providing medical treatment to aliens, adopted from Lage et al. [2019b] and Swaroop et al. [2024]. We choose to use the toy alien scenario, rather than a more realistic one (such as predicting house prices), in order to mitigate confounding from different levels of task-specific prior knowledge – i.e. humans have to rely purely on the explanation and our training, rather than prior knowledge of alien physiology. Furthermore, in order to mitigate confounding from different levels of trust in an “AI,” we remove all mentions of an “AI” and referred to “AI explanations” as information from an “alien researcher.”

For **forward prediction**, we ask users to diagnose an alien with imaginary physical traits (e.g. glow). The diagnosis is a binary label: healthy or not healthy. The underlying function (i.e. f_{box} or f_{piece}) determines the ground-truth mapping of physical traits to a diagnosis. We provide explanations in the form

of an “alien researcher’s” advice on how physical traits affect alien health. In the **forbidden features** task, we ask users to decide whether or not a doctor relied on a forbidden trait to diagnose aliens. Users will see the “alien researcher’s” opinion on the traits used by the doctor. The underlying function determines whether the doctor truly used the trait for their diagnosis.

While the story surrounding the task has been made engaging and accessible for users, the technical setup of the task maps exactly to that of our synthetic experiments. The alien’s physical traits are the inputs \mathbf{x} . The underlying function in both tasks is the function f_{box} or f_{piece} . The explanations are taken from the set of property-optimized explanations, E_{faithful} , E_{sparse} , E_{robust} , or $E_{\text{sparse and robust}}$.

Our hypotheses. As in the simulation experiments, the explanation property is the independent variable, the human’s performance on the task is the dependent variable, and the remaining pipeline components (tasks, functions, inputs) determine the experiment setting. Specifically, we test the following hypotheses from our pipeline:

- H1** On the **forward prediction** task, when the underlying function is f_{box} , participants with a *low cognitive budget* (e.g. they are subject to time pressure) will perform best with **sparse explanations**.
- H2** On the **forward prediction** task, when the underlying function is f_{box} , participants with a *high cognitive budget* (e.g. they are not subject to time pressure) will perform best with **faithful explanations** and **sparse explanations**.
- H3** On the **forbidden features** task, when the underlying function is f_{piece} , participants will perform best with **faithful explanations**.

Our hypotheses are based on the results in Section 6.3. Importantly, we are able to *omit* many of the settings that we tested in-silico, such as the forward prediction task on f_{piece} with a limited cognitive budget (see Section 6.3). This is because our simulations indicate that different explanation properties would unlikely impact performance. We note that there are many factors that can result in low cognitive budget for users, while they perform a decision-making task. In our user-studies, we enforce cognitive budget by subjecting our users to time pressure (details in Section 7.2).

7.1 Description of the user studies

Our study is conducted online through Prolific, a crowdsourcing platform. We host each task (forward prediction with diagnosing aliens, forbidden features with auditing) as a separate study. As a result, there is a possibility that the same user participated in more than one task. Within a single task, we use a between-subjects design, and users are always randomized to different explanation types. We recruit 32 participants per task, which works out as 8 participants per explanation type. All studies in our paper are approved by the Internal Review Board at Harvard University, protocol number IRB15-2076.

Before the study, participants accept a consent form, and after the study, participants fill out an exit survey. The main study consists of four parts: (1) instructions; (2) comprehension check questions; (3) a task training phase; and (4) the main study testing phase. The *instructions* introduces the scenario and describes each UI element. The *comprehension check questions* are built to assess whether the participant had a basic enough understanding of the task – which includes correctly interpreting the inputs and explanations – in order to form a proper strategy. For example, for the forward prediction task, we ask the question “According to the alien researcher, which measurement would have the *biggest effect* on the alien’s health?” to check that the participant knows that a higher absolute value meant a higher feature attribution. In the training phase, the participants have the chance to view ten practice “cases,” with the correct answers, to form a decision-making strategy. Then, in the test phase, participants apply this strategy to thirty test cases. The order of the test questions is also randomized for each participant.

In Figure 4, we provide an example of the test phase interface for the forward prediction task, in which the user must diagnose an alien. The first block describes the alien’s measurements, corresponding to the inputs \mathbf{x} . The second block contains the explanations $E(f, \mathbf{x})$. The third block lets the user provide their decision on the diagnosis, which corresponds to $h(\mathbf{x}_n)$.

Time remaining in medical shift: 6:58.
Suggested time for this alien: 0:13.

Measurements about the alien

- The alien's core temperature is **90** out of 100
- The alien's glow level is **40** out of 100
- The alien's antenna length is **20** out of 100
- The alien's hearing score is **100** out of 100



Helpful information from the alien researcher

The alien researcher says the measurements affect this alien's health in this way:

- Core temperature: **-0.13**
- Glow level: **-1**
- Antenna length : **0.6**
- Hearing: **0.5**

*Note: the closer to 0, the less influential on the alien's health

Your diagnosis

- Sick
- Healthy

Submit Answer

Figure 4: Example of user interface for the study, test phase, on the forward prediction task of diagnosing aliens. During the training phase, participants could view a number of these examples, for as long as they wished, with the correct answers given. Further detail on task setup at the beginning of Section 7.

7.2 Design choices in translating the simulation pipeline to real life

Some elements of the simulation pipeline are not straightforward to implement on real humans. In this section, we describe design choices made to align our simulation and real user studies.

Inducing a limited number of mathematical operations. Humans will be variable in the amount of cognition they are willing to apply in taking our study (we call this the *cognitive budget*). We use time pressure to incentivize all participants to limit the amount of cognitive effort they spend on the task. In our pilot studies, we find that this soft constraint, rather than a hard time cut-off, was sufficient for inducing cognitive constraints. Specifically, during the test period, participants see both a global timer for how long they had to complete the questions and a local timer which counted down a “recommended” time per task (total time divided by total number of questions); this procedure is the same as that used in Swaroop et al. [2024].

Constructing training and test phases. Mirroring the training and evaluation phase in the computational pipeline, we also include “train” and “test” phases in our user-study. During the *training phase*, users interact with ten practice questions for which the correct decisions are given. They are instructed to form a decision-making strategy and can click through these practice problems until they feel prepared to proceed. These practice problems parallel the ten training points used to train our decision tree model \hat{h} . There is no time limit or time pressure during this phase.

During the *testing phase*, participants are asked to provide decisions on thirty questions for which the correct answer is not given. The explanations during the test phase have the same properties as the explanations during the training phase. This process closely matches our simulation pipeline, in which each human model is trained and tested on one type of explanation.

Selection criteria for training points. Because we are limited in the number of examples we could provide, we select them to be as informative as possible. For example with forward prediction, we find in our pilot studies that users learn best from input points that are a mix of easy examples clearly belong

to one class because they are far from the function’s decision boundary and harder examples close to the function’s decision boundary. This is opposed to the computational model \tilde{h} , which was trained only on points near the boundary. Note that we can use the decision boundary because we have full knowledge of the underlying functions, f_{box} and f_{piece} ; in situations where the underlying function is not known, one could use the sim2real pipeline to identify a subset of training points that led to highest performance for the synthetic human and use these points for the user study.

How we picked the thirty test points. We choose the test questions under a mixture of conditions that allow us to test both Q1 (“linking properties to tasks”) and Q2 (“do simulation results match real human behavior”). Specifically, we choose ten test questions from each of the following categories:

- Questions for which the human proxy model performed the same, regardless of whether the explanation was robust, sparse, or faithful.
- Questions for which the human proxy model suggested that real users will perform *better* with the best explanation type (according to simulation) than a different explanation type.
- Questions for which the human proxy model suggested that real users will perform *worse* with the best explanation type (according to simulation) than with a different explanation type.

The best explanation types refer to the explanations that performed best on the task in the simulation experiments. For example, the “best” explanation type in the forbidden features task was the faithful explanations. Overall, this collection of test cases allows us to check whether the real user’s behavior matched the human proxy model. Moreover, by testing these distinct cases in which we believe that we are giving the real users a combination of useful and less useful explanations, we can observe the real connection between tasks and properties.

7.3 Results




Figure 5: Participant performances on each task. Higher is better. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals. Note that the forward prediction task corresponds to the alien diagnosing experiment and the forbidden features task corresponds to the alien auditing experiment.

In Figure 5 we present our initial results that support our hypotheses, though the 95% confidence intervals sometimes overlap due to our small sample size. We intend to run the study with a larger sample size in the near future. On the forward prediction task, E_{sparse} is best when there is time pressure (see Figure 5a), while E_{faith} does similarly well when the time pressure is removed (see Figure 5b). As expected, in Figure 5c, E_{faith} is best for forbidden features.

8 Limitations

What we present in this work is a proof-of-concept for an important direction to identify what properties are important for what tasks. There are several current limitations we intend to address in future work.

Larger user studies and statistical analysis. Our user studies report preliminary results on a small sample size. We plan on running the study with more participants so that we may test for statistical significance of a difference between performances between explanation types. Furthermore, we will include user study results on the forward prediction task without time pressure for E_{robust} and $E_{\text{sparse+robust}}$. There are also more tasks we could test.

Highly engineered examples. One of the primary limitations of this work is the highly engineered nature of the property-task examples in our pipeline. We purposefully engineer the setting to have a strong signal in the pipeline, so that we are more likely to recover signal in the corresponding user studies, since in general, we expect user studies to produce noisier results. During our initial exploration of different task, function, and property implementations in the pipeline, we found that most combinations did not produce signals that preferred one property over another. Furthermore, the signal we identified was highly dependent on the underlying function, data distribution, and how these things interacted with the property-optimized explanations. This implies that there is much more nuance about when there are trade-offs in properties and when those trade-offs matter.

Hardcoded optimization of explanations to properties. In our pipeline, we hard-code the optimization of explanations to properties by leveraging our knowledge of the underlying function. In real-life, these functions will be black-box functions for which this method is no longer viable. Optimizing explanations to properties when the underlying function is unknown is an interesting area for future work. One approach to optimization we consider is randomly sampling the feature attributions. However, this method is not effective at finding explanations that were distinct enough from one another regarding the properties. Our approach to optimization served the purpose of identifying explanations with different properties for the purpose of our proxy and real human studies, and future work will look to optimization for more general cases.

9 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce a Sim2Real approach for identifying what explanation properties may be most important for different tasks. We use our Sim2Real pipeline to address two research questions: (1) can we computationally link explanation properties to tasks? and (2) can we link the performance of computational proxies for humans to the performance of real humans? For question (1), we used our pipeline to identify three scenarios in which our proxy humans required different properties; forward prediction with limited operations required sparsity and fidelity, forward prediction without limited operations required fidelity, and forbidden features required fidelity. Then, for question (2), we verify the property-task relationships identified through our pipeline using user-studies..

References

- Ashraf Abdul, Christian Von Der Weth, Mohan Kankanhalli, and Brian Y Lim. Cogam: measuring and moderating cognitive load in machine learning model explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–14, 2020.
- David Alvarez Melis and Tommi Jaakkola. Towards robust interpretability with self-explaining neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.

- Naman Bansal, Chirag Agarwal, and Anh Nguyen. Sam: The sensitivity of attribution methods to hyper-parameters. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8673–8683, 2020.
- Umang Bhatt, Adrian Weller, and José MF Moura. Evaluating and aggregating feature-based model explanations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3016–3022, 2021.
- Arjun Chandrasekaran, Viraj Prabhu, Deshraj Yadav, Prithvijit Chattopadhyay, and Devi Parikh. Do explanations make vqa models more predictable to a human? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12366*, 2018.
- Valerie Chen, Gregory Plumb, Nicholay Topin, and Ameet Talwalkar. Simulated user studies for explanation evaluation. In *eXplainable AI approaches for debugging and diagnosis.*, 2021.
- Valerie Chen, Nari Johnson, Nicholay Topin, Gregory Plumb, and Ameet Talwalkar. Use-case-grounded simulations for explanation evaluation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:1764–1775, 2022a.
- Valerie Chen, Nari Johnson, Nicholay Topin, Gregory Plumb, and Ameet Talwalkar. Use-case-grounded simulations for explanation evaluation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:1764–1775, 2022b.
- Valerie Chen, Q Vera Liao, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, and Gagan Bansal. Understanding the role of human intuition on reliance in human-ai decision-making with explanations. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-computer Interaction*, 7(CSCW2):1–32, 2023.
- Zixi Chen, Varshini Subhash, Marton Havasi, Weiwei Pan, and Finale Doshi-Velez. What makes a good explanation?: A harmonized view of properties of explanations. In *Workshop on Trustworthy and Socially Responsible Machine Learning, NeurIPS 2022*, 2022c.
- Ruohan Gao, Zilin Si, Yen-Yu Chang, Samuel Clarke, Jeannette Bohg, Li Fei-Fei, Wenzhen Yuan, and Jiajun Wu. Objectfolder 2.0: A multisensory object dataset for sim2real transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10598–10608, 2022.
- Peter Hase and Mohit Bansal. Evaluating explainable AI: Which algorithmic explanations help users predict model behavior? In Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault, editors, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5540–5552, Online, July 2020a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.491. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.491>.
- Peter Hase and Mohit Bansal. Evaluating explainable ai: Which algorithmic explanations help users predict model behavior? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01831*, 2020b.
- Peter Hase and Mohit Bansal. Evaluating explainable ai: Which algorithmic explanations help users predict model behavior? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01831*, 2020c.
- Sophie Hilgard, Nir Rosenfeld, Mahzarin R Banaji, Jack Cao, and David Parkes. Learning representations by humans, for humans. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4227–4238. PMLR, 2021.
- Sebastian Höfer, Kostas Bekris, Ankur Handa, Juan Camilo Gamboa, Melissa Mozifian, Florian Golemo, Chris Atkeson, Dieter Fox, Ken Goldberg, John Leonard, et al. Sim2real in robotics and automation: Applications and challenges. *IEEE transactions on automation science and engineering*, 18(2):398–400, 2021.
- Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Chih-Kuan Yeh, Xuanqing Liu, Pradeep Ravikumar, Seungyeon Kim, Sanjiv Kumar, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Evaluations and methods for explanation through robustness analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.00442*, 2020.

- Sérgio Jesus, Catarina Belém, Vladimir Balayan, João Bento, Pedro Saleiro, Pedro Bizarro, and João Gama. How can i choose an explainer? an application-grounded evaluation of post-hoc explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 805–815, 2021.
- Jeya Vikranth Jeyakumar, Joseph Noor, Yu-Hsi Cheng, Luis Garcia, and Mani Srivastava. How can i explain this to you? an empirical study of deep neural network explanation methods. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:4211–4222, 2020.
- Abhishek Kadian, Joanne Truong, Aaron Gokaslan, Alexander Clegg, Erik Wijmans, Stefan Lee, Manolis Savva, Sonia Chernova, and Dhruv Batra. Sim2real predictivity: Does evaluation in simulation predict real-world performance? *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 5(4):6670–6677, 2020.
- Harmanpreet Kaur, Harsha Nori, Samuel Jenkins, Rich Caruana, Hanna Wallach, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. Interpreting interpretability: understanding data scientists’ use of interpretability tools for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–14, 2020.
- Buomsoo Raymond Kim, Karthik Srinivasan, Sung Hye Kong, Jung Hee Kim, Chan Soo Shin, and Sudha Ram. Rolex: A novel method for interpretable machine learning using robust local explanations. *MIS Quarterly*, 47(3), 2023.
- Todd Kulesza, Simone Stumpf, Margaret Burnett, Sherry Yang, Irwin Kwan, and Weng-Keen Wong. Too much, too little, or just right? ways explanations impact end users’ mental models. In *2013 IEEE Symposium on visual languages and human centric computing*, pages 3–10. IEEE, 2013.
- Isaac Lage, Andrew Ross, Samuel J Gershman, Been Kim, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Human-in-the-loop interpretability prior. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Isaac Lage, Emily Chen, Jeffrey He, Menaka Narayanan, Been Kim, Sam Gershman, and Finale Doshi-Velez. An evaluation of the human-interpretability of explanation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00006*, 2019a.
- Isaac Lage, Emily Chen, Jeffrey He, Menaka Narayanan, Been Kim, Sam Gershman, and Finale Doshi-Velez. An evaluation of the human-interpretability of explanation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00006*, 2019b.
- Vivian Lai, Yiming Zhang, Chacha Chen, Q Vera Liao, and Chenhao Tan. Selective explanations: Leveraging human input to align explainable ai. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 7(CSCW2): 1–35, 2023.
- Himabindu Lakkaraju, Ece Kamar, Rich Caruana, and Jure Leskovec. Faithful and customizable explanations of black box models. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 131–138, 2019.
- Piyawat Lertvitt and Francesca Toni. Human-grounded evaluations of explanation methods for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.11355*, 2019.
- Q Vera Liao, Daniel Gruen, and Sarah Miller. Questioning the ai: informing design practices for explainable ai user experiences. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–15, 2020.
- Q Vera Liao, Yunfeng Zhang, Ronny Luss, Finale Doshi-Velez, and Amit Dhurandhar. Connecting algorithmic research and usage contexts: a perspective of contextualized evaluation for explainable ai. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, volume 10, pages 147–159, 2022.
- Brian Y Lim and Anind K Dey. Assessing demand for intelligibility in context-aware applications. In *Proceedings of the 11th international conference on Ubiquitous computing*, pages 195–204, 2009.

- Runze Lin, Yangyang Luo, Xialai Wu, Junhui Chen, Biao Huang, Hongye Su, and Lei Xie. Surrogate empowered sim2real transfer of deep reinforcement learning for orc superheat control. *Applied Energy*, 356:122310, 2024.
- Yang Liu, Sujay Khandagale, Colin White, and Willie Neiswanger. Synthetic benchmarks for scientific research in explainable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.12543*, 2021.
- Ondrej Lukas and Sebastian Garcia. Bridging the explanation gap in ai security: A task-driven approach to xai methods evaluation.
- Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- M Miró-Nicolau, A Jaume-i Capó, and G Moyà-Alcover. Assessing fidelity in xai post-hoc techniques: A comparative study with ground truth explanations datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01961*, 2023.
- An-phi Nguyen and María Rodríguez Martínez. On quantitative aspects of model interpretability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07584*, 2020.
- Dong Nguyen. Comparing automatic and human evaluation of local explanations for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1069–1078, 2018.
- Forough Poursabzi-Sangdeh, Daniel G Goldstein, Jake M Hofman, Jennifer Wortman Wortman Vaughan, and Hanna Wallach. Manipulating and measuring model interpretability. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–52, 2021.
- Lennart Reiher, Bastian Lampe, and Lutz Eckstein. A sim2real deep learning approach for the transformation of images from multiple vehicle-mounted cameras to a semantically segmented image in bird’s eye view. In *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2020.
- Siddharth Swaroop, Zana Buçinca, Krzysztof Z Gajos, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Accuracy-time tradeoffs in ai-assisted decision making under time pressure. In *29th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI’24)*. ACM, 2024.
- Marco Virgolin, Andrea De Lorenzo, Eric Medvet, and Francesca Randone. Learning a formula of interpretability to learn interpretable formulas. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature—PPSN XVI: 16th International Conference, PPSN 2020, Leiden, The Netherlands, September 5-9, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16*, pages 79–93. Springer, 2020.
- Danding Wang, Qian Yang, Ashraf Abdul, and Brian Y Lim. Designing theory-driven user-centric explainable ai. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–15, 2019.
- Chih-Kuan Yeh, Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Arun Suggala, David I Inouye, and Pradeep K Ravikumar. On the (in) fidelity and sensitivity of explanations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Jianlong Zhou, Amir H Gandomi, Fang Chen, and Andreas Holzinger. Evaluating the quality of machine learning explanations: A survey on methods and metrics. *Electronics*, 10(5):593, 2021.